



All Databases

PubMed

Nucleotide

Protein

Genome

Structure

OMIM

PMC

Journals

Books

Search **PubMed** for **golgin function reviews**

Preview **Go** **Clear**

Limits Preview/Index **History** Clipboard Details

- Search History will be lost after eight hours of inactivity.
- Search numbers may not be continuous; all searches are represented.
- To save search indefinitely, click query # and select Save in My NCBI.
- To combine searches use #search, e.g., #2 AND #3 or click query # for more options.

About Entrez

Text Version

Entrez PubMed

Overview

Help | FAQ

Tutorials

New/Noteworthy

E-Utilities

PubMed Services

Journals Database

MeSH Database

Single Citation Matcher

Batch Citation Matcher

Clinical Queries

Special Queries

LinkOut

My NCBI

Search**Most Recent Queries****Time Result**#12 Search **golgin function reviews**

10:31:21 10

#11 Search **gogin function reviews**

10:31:10 7

#9 Search **gripp protein function reviews**

10:30:48 4

#8 Search **gripp protein function**

10:30:37 31

#7 Search **gripp protein fuction**

10:30:17 0

#1 Search **golgin-245 function**

10:20:04 15

Clear History

Related Resources

Order Documents

NLM Mobile

NLM Catalog

NLM Gateway

TOXNET

Consumer Health

Clinical Alerts

ClinicalTrials.gov

PubMed Central

Write to the Help DeskNCBI | NLM | NIHDepartment of Health & Human ServicesPrivacy Statement | Freedom of Information Act | Disclaimer

Oct 30 2006 07:27:22

Popa, Ileana

From: Epps-Ford, Janet
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2006 12:01 PM
To: Popa, Ileana
Subject: 2164.02 Working Example

2164.02 Working Example

Compliance with the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, does not turn on whether an example is disclosed. An example may be "working" or "prophetic." A working example is based on work actually performed. A prophetic example describes an embodiment of the invention based on predicted results rather than work actually conducted or results actually achieved.

An applicant need not have actually reduced the invention to practice prior to filing. In *Gould v. Quigg*, 822 F.2d 1074, 1078, 3 USPQ 2d 1302, 1304 (Fed. Cir. 1987), as of Gould's filing date, no person had built a light amplifier or measured a population inversion in a gas discharge. The Court held that "The mere fact that something has not previously been done clearly is not, in itself, a sufficient basis for rejecting all applications purporting to disclose how to do it." 822 F.2d at 1078, 3 USPQ2d at 1304 (quoting *In re Chilowsky*, 229 F.2d 457, 461, 108 USPQ 321, 325 (CCPA 1956)).

The specification need not contain an example if the invention is otherwise disclosed in such manner that one skilled in the art will be able to practice it without an undue amount of experimentation. *In re Borkowski*, 422 F.2d 904, 908, 164 USPQ 642, 645 (CCPA 1970).

Lack of a working example, however, is a factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art. But because only an enabling disclosure is required, applicant need not describe all actual embodiments.

NONE OR ONE WORKING EXAMPLE

When considering the factors relating to a determination of non-enablement, if all the other factors point toward enablement, then the absence of working examples will not by itself render the invention non-enabled. In other words, lack of working examples or lack of evidence that the claimed invention works as described should never be the sole reason for rejecting the claimed invention on the grounds of lack of enablement. A single working example in the specification for a claimed invention is enough to preclude a rejection which states that nothing is enabled since at least that embodiment would be enabled. However, a rejection stating that enablement is limited to a particular scope may be appropriate.

The presence of only one working example should never be the sole reason for rejecting claims as being broader than the enabling disclosure, even though it is a factor to be considered along with all the other factors. To make a valid rejection, one must evaluate all the facts and evidence and state why one would not expect to be able to extrapolate that one example across the entire scope of the claims.

Janet L. Epps-Ford, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1633
Phone #: 571-272-0757
Fax #: 571-273-0757